DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 010 EA 012 683

AUTHOR Blake, Roy F.
TITLE The Administrative Internship: Current Trends.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 47p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (112th, Anaheim, CA, February 15-18, 1980). Tables may be marginally legible due to small print of original document.
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Educational Foundations and Administration, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Admission Criteria; *Certification; *Degree Requirements; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; Objectives

ABSTRACT

This study attempted to determine the nature of the internship as it is currently being used in administrative preparation programs. Data collection included site visits, phone interviews, and written documentation from seven state agencies and 20 institutions of higher learning. The results showed that no universal pattern exists in regard to the requirements of an administrative internship for certification. In states where specific competencies are prescribed for the internship, the various institutions add additional competencies that are generated by the department acting either on its own or in consort with the field in a formal or informal way. Finally, even when the internship is not specified by certification requirements, a majority of institutions include it as a component of their degree programs for preparation of school administrators. The second half of the paper analyzes the purposes, structures, and specific practices of internship programs in various institutions. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187010

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNSHIP:

CURRENT TRENDS

by

Roy F. Blake, Professor

The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association of School Administrators, Anaheim, California, February 1980.
(This paper is taken from a more detailed study and analysis of the administrative internship.)

EA 012 683

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Blake

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Chapter One

Introduction

Some form of an experience-based or "on the job" component has been a part of teacher education programs in the United States since 1904. However, it was not until the 1950's that an internship experience began to be included in preparation programs for educational administrators. In 1960 the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) noted that the internship experience is ". . . the sine qua non of a modern program of preparation for school administrators, although no specific formula has yet been devised for such a program" (1, p. 82).

More recently (1979) the AASA position on internships included the following specific recommendations:

> Field experiences should be used to provide a practical, "hands-off" experience to allow the prospective administrator the opportunity to ascertain whether there is interest and desire to further pursue administrative experiences.
>
> Continuous evaluation of the progress of interns by cooperating agencies and institutions will assure the intern's continued development.
>
> A year long internship should be an essential and integral part of the preparation program for school administrators. Internship experiences, when jointly planned and supervised by local administrators and university personnel should provide the proper laboratory for diagnosing educational management problems and for proposing alternative courses of action.
>
> Internships should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate different experience backgrounds and career aspirations. This flexibility should be assured through involvement of different organizational levels of school systems, professional organizations, state and national education and governmental agencies. Administrative interns should be provided opportunities to test their administrative skills in a variety of educational settings and be given necessary time to plan appropriate courses of action (2, pps. 9-10).

While these recommendations provide statements of well-meaning intent, the widespread implementation of well-structured internship programs still seems to remain a problem for universities offering such programs and for practitioners alike. Haskew has stated the issue as follows:

> The internship in university school administrator training programs is the eye of one storm. This fine invention intended to meld practitioners, professors, and students into a learning team has grown itself up into a major perplexity for all concerned. The terrific (and perhaps unjustified) volume of interns and universities seeking posts; understaffing and misstaffing for university supervision; increasingly inchoate expectations for the internship; overloaded school administrators; and, scanty funds are a few of the causes for perplexity. The fundamental perplexities, however, are two: Is field-based experiental tutelage one "right" way to do professional training? If so, how can it be implemented in real life? Lacking solutions, everybody loses. Searching collaboratively, with AASA as catalyst, surely administrators and professors and students can reach profitable solutions (3, p. 3).

Despite the confusion surrounding the purposes, structures and contents of the administrative internship, a number of departments of educational administration provide internship programs for both degree seeking students and candidates for administrative certification. Exactly how many institutions include the administrative internship as either a required or elective offering in their programs is difficult to determine. Borgeson writes that: "By 1958 some twenty-three universities claimed internships in operation" (4). The Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators documented the finding that the administrative internship program had become a part of about one-fifth of the college and university programs in the country (1).

A study conducted in 1971 by the Institute of Higher Education of the University of Georgia found that of forty-one (41) institutions responding to their survey, thirty-five (35) offered some type of internship

program for students in higher education administration (5, p. 1). Thus, it appears likely that the administrative internship has become an increasingly more standard component of educational administrator preparation programs.

Similarly, state departments of education across the country have been including some form of internship experience in their requirements for administrative certification for public school employment when a candidate has not had previous administrative experience. Again, no specific data as to the universality of this requirement are available. However, it is known that Arizona made this a mandatory requirement in 1976; California in 1975; and Wisconsin will make the internship a mandatory requirement July 1, 1980.

In general the information that presently exists concerning the administrative internship is sparse and disjointed. Perhaps, as Haskell has suggested, it is ". . . a major perplexity for all concerned." No recent study has undertaken the task of determining current practices in regard to the internship at various institutions of higher learning which provide preparation programs in education administration.

Statement of the Problem

If, as it appears, the internship experience has become an essential component of administrative preparation programs, the question to be answered is: "What constitutes an administrative internship?" It would be useful to know the present "state of the art" in those institutions which offer such a program.

Once current practices have been assessed, an analysis of the commonalities among these programs could lead to some conclusions concerning the overall nature of the internship program. That is, what exactly is its function in administrative preparation programs? In what way is the

internship organized and structured in relationship to certification and degree programs? And finally, what specific components comprise an internship--what is the length of time commonly spent in internship activities, who supervises the intern in the field and other such questions need answers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of the internship as it is currently being utilized in administrative preparation programs. Specifically, this study will attempt to:

1) Locate and analyze the current administrative certification requirements from a number of states to determine what relationship, if any, exists between state certification policies and regulations and internship programs provided for both degree and certification candidates.
2) Analyze the purposes, structure and specific elements of internship programs in selected institutions of higher learning to determine what constitutes common practice in these programs.
3) Analyze the specific impact of a state mandated internship program on university practices in one state (Arizona) in order to draw some conclusions about the operational consequences of this requirement.
4) Organize the findings concerning internship practices in such a way as to provide a comprehensive model for the design of internship programs.

Significance of the Study

This study will provide current empirical data on the purposes, structure and contents of representative internship programs. The information derived can be used by decision makers at various educational levels to make future determinations about internship programs, administrative preparation programs and certification policies and regulations.

Summary

This chapter has shown that the administrative internship is considered to be an essential part of administrative preparation programs. Despite the widespread use of the internship among institutions of higher learning, little is known about what constitutes common practice from state to state and institution to institution. Chapter Two presents the design of the study which will be utilized to locate and order the data needed to determine present practices in internship programs.

Chapter Two

Design of the Study

This chapter presents the overall design of the study which was used to gather data necessary to respond to the following types of questions*:

Questions of Purposes/Goals

- How is the internship related to administrative preparation programs in general and to state certification for administrators specifically?
- What is the purpose of the internship?
- What goals or objectives are to be accomplished during the internship?

Questions of Structure/Internal Relationships

- What form or structure is there to internship programs?
- What relationships exist among parties who are concerned with the program--namely the State Departments of Education, the universities, and school districts?
- What mechanisms or criteria exist for evaluating internships from the point of view of the respective parties?

Questions of Content/Specifics

- What constitutes an internship, i.e., how long is it, when is it done, where is it done, is there remuneration for interns, is credit offered; if so, how much. etc.?

---

*The ordering or leveling of these questions is based on a model developed by T. F. Saunders (6, pps. 169-178).

. What constitutes a "successful" internship, i.e., is the program competency based, what competencies are typically included, who establishes the competencies, how is the intern evaluated, etc.?
. What records or forms are used to implement the internship, i.e., what agreements are signed by interns, school districts, universities, what culminating events occur, what retrieval mechanisms are used for documentation of the internship, etc.?

Categories of Data

In order to respond to these and similar questions, data were collected first which provided information on the Certification Requirements specified by the agency responsible for administering statutory or State Board of Education provisions. Secondly, data were collected which provided information on how various departments of educational administration (or similar organizational units within institutions of higher education) design internship programs in relationship to the legal and policy requirements. Thirdly, data were collected which provided information on how administrative graduate degree and administrative certification programs are related to the administrative internship.

The fourth step undertaken consisted of collecting data which provided information on the components of the internship program itself. The format used for ordering these data is shown in Figure I.

Sample of Agencies and Institutions

The agencies and institutions from which data for this study were gathered represent a selective sampling chosen primarily for the following reasons:

FIGURE 1 , INTERNSHIP COMPONENTS

PURPOSES:

STRUCTURE:

SPECIFICS:

STUDENT:
- . SELECTION
- . APPLICATION
- . ADMISSION
- . REGISTRATION
- . ACTIVITIES

COOPERATING AGENCY:
- . SELECTION
- . COMPENSATION
- . FUNCTIONS OF SUPERVISING ADMINISTRATORS
- . CONTRACT/LEGAL ARRANGEMENTS

INSTITUTIONAL:

ACADEMIC PROVISIONS:
- . CREDIT
- . PREREQUISITES
- . GRADING/EVALUATION

DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE:
- . INTERNSHIP COORDINATION
- . IMPLEMENTATION
- . FACULTY LOAD/EQUIVALENCY

- Similarity of concerns to the state and home institution (The University of Arizona) of the investigator.
- Representativeness of internship programs in terms of similar institutions within a given state.
- Financial ability of the investigator to travel to the various sites to conduct interviews.

Within these guidelines seven state agencies responsible for administering administrative certification programs and twenty institutions of higher education were chosen to provide data on the administrative internship (see Appendix 1).

Procedures and Sources of Data

In order to gather the necessary data, three procedures were employed. The first consisted of making site visitations to four state agencies and seventeen institutions of higher education. Structured interviews were conducted with twenty-four persons who either held positions in state agencies or who were department chairmen or internship coordinators at their respective institutions. Phone interviews constituted a second procedure used. One state agency and two institutions of higher education provided data in this fashion. The third procedure employed was to collect all written documentation that either a state agency or institution of higher education had pertaining to administrative certification and internship programs. In cases where visitations were made, the written documentation was obtained at the respective sites. Contacts made by telephone provided written materials through the mails. Two state agencies and two institutions of higher education provided data in this fashion. In several cases "follow up" phone calls were made to obtain additional information or to request written documents.

Summary

This chapter has presented the design of the study which was derived from three types or levels of questions that would elicit data necessary to: place the internship in either a legal or regulatory perspective; determine the relationship of the internship to degree and certification programs; and provide details on specific components of the internship program itself.

Four categories of data: Certification Requirements; Administrative Internships' Relationship to Certification; Administrative Internships' Relationship to Degree Programs; and Administrative Internship Components were developed. The next chapter presents an analysis of the data as it was ordered in the above categories for the seven state agencies and twenty institutions of higher education included in this study.

Chapter Four

The Findings

This chapter presents the overall findings concerning the administrative internship based on the data presented in the preceding chapter. Utilizing the format established for categorizing the data, the findings will be presented in four major sections: Certification Requirements; Administrative Internship's Relationship to Certification; Administrative Internship's Relationship to Degree Programs; and Administrative Internship Components.

Certification Requirements

Requirements for administrative certification were obtained from seven states. Table 1 which follows summarizes the essential aspects of the certification process in these states. It can be noted that the state department of education or its equivalent is responsible for issuing certification in five of these states. Two states (California and Oregon) have licensing agencies which are separate from the state educational agency. Six of the seven states offer two ways to obtain certificates: evaluation by the state agency and the university approved program route. California (as of 1978) was unique in providing for certification by examination. Idaho, while utilizing the two means noted is unique in its reciprocity provision.

In regard to the Certification Program Structure for approved programs, two classifications of programs were made arbitrarily--traditional and competency based. Although in practice these two classifications may not be mutually exclusive, it was possible to make this distinction from the language of the statute or policy statement from the agencies surveyed. In general, traditional refers to a program which specifies course work in certain general areas and competency

TABLE 1, CERTIFICATION COMPONENTS BY STATE

COMPONENTS / STATE	AGENCY RESPONSIBLE	WAYS TO OBTAIN CERTIFICATION	CERTIFICATION PROGRAM STRUCTURE	CERTIFICATION TYPES	INTERNSHIP REQUIRED	ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE REQUIRED	DEGREE LEVEL/ SEMESTER HOURS REQUIRED	SEMESTER HOURS IN EDUC. ADMIN REQUIRED	TEACHING EXPERIENCE REQUIRED
Arizona	State Dept. of Education	1. State Dept. Evaluation 2. University Approved Program	Traditional	Supervisory (K-12) Principal (Elem/Secon) Superintendent (K-12)	Yes, or Yes, or Yes, or	3 years 3 years 5 years	Master's + 15 hrs. (45 min) Master's + 27 hrs. (54 min) Master's + 33 hrs. (60 min)	15 27 33	3 years 3 years 3 years
California	Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing	1.Examination 2.University Approved Program 3.Admin. Serv. Internship	Competency Based Competency Based	Administrative Services Credential K-12	No Yes Yes	No No No	Master's	Approx. 32	3 years 3 years 3 years
Idaho	State Dept. of Education	1.State Dept. Evaluation 2.Reciprocity (Spec.States) 3.University Approved Program	Traditional	Elem. Prin Secon. Prin Superintendent	Strongly Recommended Strongly Recommended Yes, or	No No 1 year	Master's Master's 6th year Program	Approx. 20 Approx. 20 Approx. 30	3 years 3 years 2 years (K-12)
Illinois	State Dept. of Education	1.State Dept. Evaluation 2.University Approved Program	Traditional	General Sup'y General Adm. Chief Bus. Off Superintendent	No No No No	No No No 2 years	Master's Master's Masters + 30 hrs.	Approx. 16 Approx. 15 Approx. 11 Approx. 27	2 years 2 years 2 years
Oregon	Teacher Standards and Practices Commission	1.State Dept. Evaluation 2.Approved Program	Traditional Traditional Traditional	Restricted cert. of accom. Basic: Prin Sup't Standard: Prin Sup't	No No 1 year and or	Yes No 2 years . 3 years	- Master's Master's	- Approx. 18 Approx. 24	- - -
Washington	Office of Sup't of Public Instruction	1.OSI Evaluation 2.Approved Program	Traditional plus Competency (Minimum Generic Standards)	Prin: Initial Continuing Supt*: Initial Continuing	No No 1 year and No	No 3 years 3 years 3 yrs. as Asst.Supt.	Bach + 20 hrs. Master's Master's + 10 hrs. Master's + 20 hrs.	- - - -	3 years - - -
(Effective 7/1/80) Wisconsin	Dept. of Public Instruction	1.DPI Evaluation 2.Approved Program	Competency Based	Elem.Admin. (Initial) Secon.Admin. (Initial Dist.Admin. (Initial)	No No No	No No No	Master's Master's Ed.Spec. Degree or Equiv		3 years 3 years

*Certification is not required for the chief administrative officer of a school district.

based refers to whatever each state means by that term (see the descriptions in the preceding text for further elaboration on this point). In Table 1, a program was listed as competency based if the certification document used this term. Thus, of the seven states studied, four state agencies specify traditional requirements for certification. Two states, Wisconsin and California, stipulate generic competencies which are to be met and Washington specifies a mix of traditional and competency requirements which are necessary for certification.

In regard to types of certification, only one state of those surveyed, California, provides for a generic administrative credential. The remaining six states in some way distinguish among administrative levels below that of a district's chief administrative officer. As to length of certification, Oregon, Washington and Wisconsin maintain an "initial" and "standard" distinction. In these cases an "initial" certificate is often used as an entry into administration as a supervisor or principal and a "standard" certificate is taken to be a prerequisite step to a chief administrative credential. One interesting anomaly was found in the State of Washington where state certification is not required for the person serving as a superintendent of schools.

No universal pattern was found in regard to the requirements of an administrative internship for certification. However, the requirements of previous administrative experience and internship are directly related. That is, in general where anywhere from one to five years of administrative experience have not been obtained, an internship of anywhere from a semester's to a year's duration is required in lieu of such experience. For example, in Oregon in order to obtain a standard principal's certificate, a one year internship and two years of experience are required. In Washington a one year internship and three years of experience are required in order to obtain an initial superintendent's certificate. In Idaho the internship is "strongly recommended" for

certification as either an elementary or secondary principal, whereas the internship is required for the superintendent unless a year's experience has been obtained.

A great deal of commonality was found as to degree requirements for administrative certification. Only one state, Washington, grants certification (albeit initial) for the principalship with less than a master's degree (bachelor's plus twenty graduate semester hours). Two states, Idaho and Wisconsin, require a Sixth Year Program or an Educational Specialist degree (or equivalent) respectively for a superintendent's certificate. The other four states all require a minimum of a master's degree.

In addition to the requirement of a master's degree, all of the states surveyed except Washington have specific semester course work requirements in educational administration. In general these requirements range from fifteen to thirty-two semester hours depending upon the type of administrative certificate being sought. Since most of the states provide certification for a range of administrative assignments beginning with the supervisor and ending with the superintendent (or equivalent job titles), a cumulative effect occurs in semester hour requirements specifically in educational administration course work. In essence a "career ladder" assumption is in operation and the higher one climbs the "ladder" the greater the degree of specialization in educational administration course work becomes a requirement.

Finally, of the states surveyed, only one, Oregon, does not require previous teaching experience in order to obtain an administrative certificate. The mode for this requirement is three years and the minimum is two years. So, again, evidence of an assumption of a "career ladder" in this case from teaching to administration has been documented.

Administrative Internship's Relationship to Certification

Eight components were chosen to determine the types of relationships that existed between the internship program and certification requirements in the institutions and states included in this study. These eight areas, analyzed on an institution by institution basis, are shown in Table 2. The first concern was whether or not the institutions in question provided a state department of education (or equivalent agency) approved program for certification. Of the twenty institutions studied only two, the University of California, Los Angeles (U.C.L.A.) and Oregon State University, did not. The University of California, Los Angeles does not offer such a program by choice and Oregon State University is restricted by policy of the state's university governing board to offering only courses which have reciprocity with courses offered at the University of Oregon for purposes of administrative certification.

In all states but Illinois the internship is required for the university approved certification program (Idaho requires the internship for the superintendent's certification, but not for the principal's certification). Thus there is a one to one correspondence between the state requirement and the institutional requirement. The University of Illinois requires an internship (called a practicum) for all three types of certification endorsement programs it provides even though the state does not mandate this component for certification.

Likewise, all institutions indicate that their internship programs are competency based when the state agency requires that they be so structured. In Arizona where the SDE does not require a competency based internship, Arizona State University (ASU) and Northern Arizona University (NAU) have specified categories of competencies to be accomplished during the internship. The source of the competency categories at ASU is both the department and what

TABLE 2, ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNSHIP'S RELATIONSHIP TO CERTIFICATION

STATE AND INSTITUTION / COMPONENTS	ARIZONA			CALIFORNIA								IO	ILL	MINN	OREGON		WASH		WISC
	ASU	NAU	THE U of A	CS LA	CS Northridge	CS SF	CS SJ	STANFORD UNIV.	UCB	UCLA	USC	UNIV OF IDAHO	UNIV OF ILL	UM	PSU	UO	UW	WSU	UW(M)
Provides SDE (or Equivalent Agency) Approved Program	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State Requires Internship for Certification	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Supt. only	No	-	Yes (Practicum)	Yes (Practicum)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Institution Approved Program Requires Internship	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes (Practicum)	Yes (Practicum)	Yes	Yes	Yes
State Requires Competency Based" Internship Program	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	No	No	-	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
State Specifies Competency Categories	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	No	No	-	No	No	Yes Minimum Generic Standard	Yes Minimum Generic Standard	Yes
Institution Specifies (Additional) Competency Categories	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Source of Institutional Competency Categories	Dept/ Field	Dept.	-	Dept/ Field	Field	Dept/ Field	Dept/ Field	Dept/ Field	Dept/ Field	Indiv. Arrangement	Dept/ Field	Dept.	-	Dept/ NASSP	Dept/ Coop Dist	Dept/ Coop Dist	Dept.	Dept/ Field "Educ Consortium	Dept. Coop Dist
Institution Specifies Areas of Study	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

has been specified as "the field." This means that some formal procedure has been adopted to receive inputs from practicing administrators.

In California all institutions which have been endorsed by the Commission to offer approved programs are required to utilize the same six competency categories (see Appendix X). Additionally, the Commission specifies the manner in which working arrangements with the field (i.e., practicing administrators in districts, teachers' and administrators' associations, etc.) are to be conducted in regard to university approved programs. Thus, in all of the California institutions studied with the exception of U.C.L.A., the internship program is competency based. U.C.L.A. has neither an approved program nor a competency based program. (Again, by choice!) California State University, Northridge, has derived its competencies from both the state and from categories of competencies provided by principals' associations.

Idaho's State Department of Education does not mandate a competency based internship program; however, the University of Idaho's Department of Educational Administration specifies eight "Functional Areas" in which specific competencies are required. In Illinois, the S.D.E. mandates areas of study for its various types of certification, but does not specific particular competencies. The University of Illinois, likewise, does not specify a competency based internship other than the program objectives that are developed for each intern.

The University of Minnesota although not specifically referring to its program as competency based does provide two separate sets of Guidelines which constitute the substantive element of the program. One set of guidelines is taken from that developed by the National Association of Secondary Principles and the other has been provided by the department.

Portland State University and the University of Oregon follow the TSPC standards which require a practicum, a component of the university approved certification program. In the case of Portland State, the practicum is nearly always an internship in a school setting. The University of Oregon offers "field experience" through the Field Service Training Bureau and course in simulation as alternative ways to satisfy the practicum requirement. Neither of these institutions has a defined competency based structure. In general objectives and activities are arranged on an individual student basis by the supervising administrator, university coordinator and the intern.

In Washington, both Washington State University (W.S.U.) and the University of Washington (U.W.) provide certification and internship programs which meet the S.P.I. Minimum Generic Standards, which best can be described as a combination traditional/competency based structure. At U.W. the department specifies that the internship should include experiences in what might be described as a combination of functions and activities, e.g., ". . . counseling students, conferring with parents, supervising attendance, holding staff meetings, evaluating the instructional program, enforcing discipline and supervision of instruction" (5, p. 1).

The internship program at W.S.U. may be described as essentially competency based. The source of the competencies which constitute the substance of the internship program is the field. In this case the field is a formally organized structure operating through Educational Service District No. 123 Administrator's Education Consortium.

Wisconsin has made school code revisions which will result in new State Department of Public Instruction rules for the certification of administrators beginning in 1980. Under these new rules approved programs shall: ". . . include a practicum and shall be competency based" (60, p. 18). The University

of Wisconsin, Madison (UWM) has had in operation an internship program which has elements of what is conventionally considered to be competency based. Twenty "Task" or Skill areas constitute the substance of the internship. These twenty "Task" areas have been generated over time by the department with considerable formal feedback from supervising administrators in cooperating districts and interns themselves.

In general it can be concluded that in states where specific competencies are prescribed for the internship, the various institutions add additional competencies which are either generated by the department acting on its own or in consort with the field in either a formal or informal way. California institutions for the most part exemplify this practice.

In states where the SDE or similar agency does not mandate specific competencies, the trend is for departments of educational administration, again acting either independently or in consort with the field, in some way to generate specific competencies. In Arizona, ASU and NAU are institutions which typify this practice. Of the twenty institutions studied in this project only three, The University of Arizona, University of California at Los Angeles, and the University of Illinois, have not developed competency based internship programs.

It must be noted also, however, that in all twenty institutions studied, whether or not either the state mandated a competency based program or the department of educational administration described its program as competency based, there was still a strong element of the traditional "areas of study" emphasis to university approved certification programs. That is, the program descriptions of the institutions represented revealed in case after case an emphasis on "areas of study" which included on the one hand such subject matter areas as: law, supervision of instruction, personnel, finance and business management. On the other hand, a large number of institutions refer to "areas

of study" which appeared to be more conceptual and perhaps even ethereal such as: leadership, problem solving, decision making and innovation. Further, in many if not in most cases, these two categories of "areas of study" were not always presented as being mutually exclusive.

Administrative Internship's Relationship to Degree Programs

In order to determine this aspect of the internship, six components were selected as being indicative of the internship/degree program relationship. Table 3 presents these six components on an institution by institution basis. The first concern was whether or not admission to either a degree program or a certification program was required for participation in the internship. In terms of the former question, three institutions, the University of Arizona, University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Oregon, permit the internship to be taken only as part of the Certification program. Undoubtedly, the University of Arizona is the most lenient in this respect as students may participate in a Certification Program and in the internship without matriculating in a degree program. The only status required is that of "Unclassified Graduate Student." Conversely the Administrative Certification Programs at the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) and at the University of Oregon (UO) are treated similarly to degree programs for purposes of admission. The UCB program has stringent admission requirements based on an elaborate field/university central structure and the admission to the UO program requires: a minimum of a master's degree, three letters of reference and a satisfactory score (Ordinarily the fortieth 40th percentile) on the Miller's Analogy Test. A five member committee screens applicants for the credentials program on the basis of these criteria.

In the case of the California State University institutions, their requirements are essentially the same, since they all follow the California

TABLE 3, ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNSHIP'S RELATIONSHIP TO DEGREE PROGRAMS

INSTITUTIONS / COMPONENTS	ASU	NAU	THE U of A	CS LA	CS Northridge	CS SF	CS SJ	STANFORD UNIV.	UCB	UCLA	USC	UNIV. OF IDAHO	UNIV. OF ILL.	UM	PSU	UO	UW	WSU	UW(M)
Internship Participation Requires Admission to Degree Program	Yes	Yes	No	Either Degree or	Either Degree or	Either Degree or	Either Degree or	Yes	No	Yes* *Must be full time student	Yes	EITHER DEGREE OR	EITHER DEGREE OR	Yes* *Must be full time student	Yes	No	Yes	Either Degree or	Yes
Internship Participation Requires Admission to Certification Program	Yes	No	Yes	Cert. Program	Cert. Program	Cert. Program	Cert. Program	Yes	Yes	N.A.	No	Cert. Program	Cert. Program	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cert. Program	Yes
Degree and Certification Program May Be Completed Simultaneously	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Master's Degree Program Requires An Internship	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes	No	Elective	Elective	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Specialists' Degree Program Requires An Internship	Yes	Yes	Yes	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Yes	No	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Elective	Yes*	N.A.	No	N.A.	N.A.	Yes
Doctors' Degree Program Requires An Internship	Yes	Yes	No	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes	No	Elective	Yes*	N.A.	No	Elective	Yes	Yes

N.A. indicates not applicable

Commission's guidelines. Intern participants at these institutions must be enrolled in either a degree program or the certification program and ordinarily this means matriculation in a master's degree program and a certification program simultaneously. The University of Idaho, the University of Illinois and Washington State University follow essentially the same practices as these California institutions. In all of the institutions surveyed, it is possible for students to parallel administrative certification programs with one or another degree programs.*

The next concern in this section was with the relationship of the internship to the specific graduate degrees of master's, specialist or doctorate. In Arizona all three institutions are similar in that an internship is not a requirement for the master's degree in educational administration. This is primarily a function of the state certification requirements which make it operationally mandatory for the certification program in administration to be preceded by an initial master's degree in an area other than educational administration.

For the similar reason of the Commission's guidelines, all California state institutions, along with Stanford, the University of California, Los Angeles and the University of California, require an internship in the master's degree program. The University of California, Berkeley, because of its highly structured certification program, ordinarily has few approved program candidates who do not already possess a master's degree. Hence the internship is not required at the master's degree level.

Among the remaining institutions, only Portland State University, the University of Washington, Washington State University and the University of

---

*Generally, initial certification with a master's degree and standard or advanced certification (superintendent) with specialist and/or doctoral programs.

Wisconsin require an internship for the master's degree. Both the University of Illinois and the University of Minnesota specify the internship as a "recommended" elective at this degree level. In summary then, eleven of the institutions require the internship at the master's degree level, eight do not and the question does not apply to the twentieth, Oregon State.

In regard to educational specialist degree (or similar sixth year program), the question is moot for all of the California state institutions by virtue of the legal limitations on their advanced degree programs. The same is true of Portland State University and in several of the other institutions the materials gathered did not make it explicit whether or not the internship was required for the specialist degree. It was determined, however, that Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, the University of Arizona, Stanford University, the University of Minnesota and the University of Wisconsin do require the internship at this degree level.

When analyzing the information concerning internships at the doctoral level, the same conditions concerning advanced degrees hold for the California state institutions and Portland State. It is more productive, therefore, to report that of the fourteen (14) institutions which offer doctoral degrees only five (5): the University of Arizona, the University of California, Berkeley, the University of Idaho, the University of Illinois and the University of Washington, do not require an internship. Of these five the University of Illinois and the University of Washington list the internship as a "recommended" elective. It is also of interest that at the University of California, Los Angeles, and at the University of Minnesota one must be a full time student to participate in the internship.

The evidence available on advanced degree programs can be used to conclude that even when the internship is not required by certification requirements

a majority of institutions include it as a component of their degree programs for preparation of school administrators. However, it must be noted that in many cases, the internship may or may not be a requirement for those persons who enter degree programs after having had considerable administrative experience as a principal, assistant superintendent or superintendent. Such nuances of preparation programs are difficult either to document or to quantify because of the latitude usually allowed to persons who are working at advanced degree levels.*

Internship Components

In order to address the nature of the internship itself, an increased number of categories and subcategories of information were developed. Figure 1 shows the elements that were used to delineate the various aspects of internship programs in the institutions studied. In general the data presented in Chapter Three which described the internship components in the twenty institutions form an array which proceeds from a relatively small number of purposes, to a larger number of structural elements, to an almost infinite number of specific elements when presented in the format selected. Also, it must be noted that a certain amount of arbitrariness was employed to summarize the diversity of purposes, structures and specific practices existing among the various institutions.

Purposes

In analyzing this component it was found that statements of purpose or purposes for the internship ranged from the most general to the very specific;

For example, at the University of Arizona the only course required in either the Ed.D. or Ph.D. program is Advanced Statistics.

FIGURE 1 , INTERNSHIP COMPONENTS

PURPOSES:

STRUCTURE:

SPECIFICS:

STUDENT:
- . SELECTION
- . APPLICATION
- . ADMISSION
- . REGISTRATION
- . ACTIVITIES

COOPERATING AGENCY:
- . SELECTION
- . COMPENSATION
- . FUNCTIONS OF SUPERVISING ADMINISTRATORS
- . CONTRACT/LEGAL ARRANGEMENTS

INSTITUTIONAL:

ACADEMIC PROVISIONS:
- . CREDIT
- . PREREQUISITES
- . GRADING/EVALUATION

DEPARTMENTAL STRUCTURE:
- . INTERNSHIP COORDINATION
- . IMPLEMENTATION
- . FACULTY LOAD/EQUIVALENCY

from the most noble and overarching to the more practical and mundane. It is in this order that a representative summary of stated purposes of the internship are presented. The caveat withstanding that in many cases no stated purposes for the internship exist. It should be noted also that many institutions in their individual statements of purpose lay claim to more than one of the types of purposes shown below.

. Develop educational leadership

Statements of this type emphasize the environmental conditions of the administrative function and the need for the development of broadened perspectives by means of the internship. E.g., "To sensitize future administrators to the necessity for courageous and creative leadership at all levels of the educational enterprise, it (the internship) is demanded by the increasingly complex requirements of the administrative positions themselves. It is an investment in leadership from which the cooperating agency, the University and the intern will derive benefit . . . . to develop educational leadership for the improvement of education for all youth who come to our schools."

. Obtain feedback from the "field" to improve the overall preparation program

Statements of this type emphasize the necessity to utilize the experience of the supervising administrator, the "real" world setting and the activities of the intern as a kind of laboratory from which general administrative principles and content can be derived to modify program structures and course content in the preparation of educational administrators. E.g., The purpose of the internship is ". . . to meet current needs in the field . . . . providing feedback to improve training program."

. Provide reciprocal benefits for personnel in the "field" and in the university

Statements of this type emphasize the need for university personnel to participate in the happenings of the "real" world and the need for practicing administrators to stay abreast of latest theoretical developments, research and the like. E.g., "To stimulate both the intern and the supervising administrator to expand and improve their knowledge of concepts and research in administration." "To encourage and assist (university) staff members to maintain and increase their knowledge of contemporary educational problems and administrative practices."

. Provide an opportunity to put theory into practice

Statements of this type emphasize the theory/practice dichotomy. The practice completes a learning cycle. E.g., "To provide outstanding candidates a practical experience in the day-to-day administration and operation of educational institutions." "This administrative experience will help the student relate theory to practice in the day-to-day operations of the school system and develop the skills and competencies necessary in handling administrative problems." ". . . that of integrating theory with practice, that is, assisting students in relating theoretical considerations of administrative course work with that of practical fieldwork related problems."

. Serve as a screening mechanism for both the school district and the individual interns

Statements of this type emphasize the opportunity the internship provides to test out potential administrators within their district and/or for persons contemplating the step into administration to determine if this is a career option that they wish to pursue. E.g., "The program provides a means for school districts to offer on the job preparation programs for persons possessing promise

as school administrators, supervisors, coordinators, program directors and the like." ". . . determine the student's potential as an administrator."

"It is an opportunity for the University and the local school systems to work together in training well qualified school administrators."

"Other considerations . . . include career planning for administrators . . ."

. Meet state certification requirements

Statements of this type primarily emphasize the legal and regulatory requirements for the internship. E.g., "Each candidate in the ASC program will experience an internship in a public school setting."

"The curriculum of each program shall include direct or simulated experiences and/or internship in public school settings of sufficient quality and length to meet program objectives."

"This cooperative experience (internship) is required for all candidates preparing for administrator's credentials or certificates of competency, except those who already had sufficient experience as administrators."

. Add to the students' skills and competencies in some general way

Statements of this type are of an "off hand" variety--they essentially proclaim that no specific rationale is required. E.g., "The value of such a field experience appears to be self-evident. It provides the opportunity to learn some of the practical skills and techniques demanded by the work directly from an experienced school administrator."

"To gain knowledge of the tasks and roles of school administrators."

". . . to provide the student with opportunities for participation in as wide a range of administrator activities as possible."

". . . close cooperative action on the part of successful school administrators and competent university professors can achieve the goal of qualifying an outstanding experienced teacher to begin a career in school administration."

Structure

This section analyzes the framework within which various elements of the internship take place. In order to perform this analysis, several categories were selected to summarize pertinent data. These categories include: The Format; The Length/Clock Hours/Credit Hours; The Seminar Component; and The Major Project Component. It should be noted that in the analysis of the California institutions reference is being made to the fieldwork component as a part of the ASC approved program, rather than the internship as the ASC Internship program. Also Oregon State University is not included in this analysis since it does not offer a formal internship program.

The Format

In general, although not always exclusively, the format of the internship may be classified in two ways: The Internship Plan Format and the Competency Based Format. The emphasis that the various institutions used to describe their programs in one or the other of the above ways was the determining factor in classifying them, even though in some cases some combination of the two formats may be employed. One example of this is USC where a plan comprised of elements of prescribed generic competencies or activities is required of the intern.

In the categories that follow the formats and components of the internship are delineated first and then examples of institutions which essentially offer program components which fit these delineations are cited. Whenever available data provided the specific details of program components, parenthetical distinctions were made.

. Internship Plan Format

In this program structure the substantive aspects of the internship typically are developed cooperatively by the intern, the university supervisor, and the supervising administrator. The emphasis is on an individualized set of

objectives and activities for each intern commensurate with the school setting.

Institutions: The U of A, UCLA, U of Ill, PSU, UO, WU

. Competency Based Format

In this program structure the substantive aspects of the internship typically are based on specified categories of administrative functions within which certain tasks or activities must be completed as a demonstration of competence.

Institutions: ASU, NAU, CSLA, CS Northridge, CSSF, CSSJ, UCB, USC, U of Idaho, UM, WSU, WU(M).

Length of Internship/Clock Hours/Credit Hours

This component of the internship takes several forms and the various institutions generally provide more than one of the arrangements as classified below.

. One semester, 150-200 clock hours, three (3) semester hours credit

This type of internship generally is undertaken by students whose participation is on a part time basis while they are employed on a full time basis. Students who complete the internship in this manner for the most part were working at the master's degree level or who were seeking only an endorsement for some type of administrative certificate.

Institutions: This form of time arrangement was the one most commonly occurring at: ASU, NAU*, The U of A, CSSF (160-320 clock hours), USC, U of Illinois (four (4) semester hours credit), PSU, and UO (two quarter hours credit).

. Two semesters, 250-350 clock hours, six semester hours of credit

This type of internship generally is undertaken by students whose participation is on a part time basis while they are employed on a full time basis.

---

*Intern must devote half time to internship activities; two semesters are required otherwise.

Again, the most common practice found was that students completing this type of internship were working at the Master's degree level or who were seeking only an administrative credential.

Institutions: This form of time arrangement was the one most commonly occurring at: CSLA (three quarters, 270 clock hours, nine quarter hours credit); CS Northridge (270 clock hours); CSSJ; Stanford U (half time must be devoted to the internship by students who are otherwise employed); UCB (three quarters, nine quarter hours credit); UCLA (two quarters, eight quarter hours credit); Idaho, WU (minimum of 180 clock hours); and WSU.

. Two Semesters, Full Time Participation, Six to Nine Semester Hours Credit

This type of internship is generally undertaken by full time students who are working at the Educational Specialist or Doctor's degree level.

Institutions: UM (nine quarter hours credit), UW(M) (six semester hours credit*).

Seminar Component

Inclusion of attendance at university planned seminars appeared in many cases to be utilized as a nexus between the activities of the intern in the field and the academic aspects of the administrative preparation program. The emphasis given to this internship component and the broader details attending to its implementation in the various institutions have been classified as follows.

. Major emphasis on the Seminar

In this type of internship the seminar is viewed as crucial aspect of the internship. Academic credit is awarded for participation in the

*UW(M) also offers a one semester "field work" type of internship which satisfies initial administrative certification requirements; however, the department emphasizes the year long program.

seminar and the field activities are considered as a means of generating content material for discussion at seminars.

Institutions: UCB (Biweekly seminar sessions for each of the three quarters); UM (weekly seminar sessions for three quarters); and U Stanford (biweekly meetings on campus for two quarters).

. Seminars included as a component

In this type of internship the seminar is used variously to: augment field experiences; serve as a vehicle for maintaining contacts with the interns in the field in some formalized way; and to recapitulate and analyze various activities and issues of field experiences.

Institutions: NAU (two day workshop in the spring); The U of A (four to five seminars of one and a half to two hours length each semester); CS Northridge (no regularly scheduled seminars, but are provided as needed); CSSJ (four day-long seminars per semester); UW (no specified number); WSU (three full day seminars per year); UW(M) (one seminar per month throughout the year).

. No seminar component included Institutions: ASU; CSLA*: CSSF: UCLA: USC: U of Idaho, U of Illinois; PSU; and OU.

Major Project Component

In addition to day to day administrative activities, a number of institutions included some form of extended involvement in some administrative issue or problem as an essential component of the internship. In some cases this involvement was specified as having to result in some written document, in other cases it was not specified whether or not some written result should ensue. Thus, it

*Seminar attendance is required for only the ASC Internship Program--two times monthly for two and a half hour seminar sessions.

TABLE 4 SPECIFIC COMPONENTS: STUDENT

INSTITUTION / COMPONENT	ASU	NAU	U OF A	CSLA	CS Northridge	CSSF
Selection	Be accepted into the Graduate Program in Ed.Ad. for either a Degree or Cert. Program	.Complete 12 semester hours in Ed.Ad. coursework. .Be accepted into a Degree or Cert. Program .Arrange assignment	.Be accepted into Certification Program .Complete 12-15 hours in Ed.Ad. coursework	.Be accepted into Master's degree or Credential Program . 2.75 GPA . Field Recommen . Dept. Admission Exam . Prof Recommen . Dept. Screening Committee	.Be accepted into Degree or Cert Program .Complete two courses in Ed. Ad. specialty areas .Recommendations from field administrators Approval of Supervising Administrator	.Complete course in "Admin Process" .Be admitted to Adv. Grad. Status based on: . Letters of reference from field administrator . Advisor . Professors
Application	Complete application and submit a one page vita	Apply to Internship Coordinator	Apply to Internship Coordinator the semester preceding internship	Apply to Department one quarter before start of internship	Apply to Department by April 1 November 1	.Attend orientation meeting .Arrange site and Supervising Administrator .Complete competency analysis .Complete training plan
Admission	Permission of Advisor or Internship Coordinator	University Supervisor makes site visit to receive District written authorization	By Internship Coordinator when Internship Plan is approved	By Dept. Screening Committee when core of 7 quarter hours in Ed.Ad. are completed and official program is approved	By Dept. Screening Committee	.By Dept. Screening Committee .By University Advisor's acceptance of Training Plan
Registration	Fall Semester Spring Semester Summer Session	Fall Semester Spring Semester Summer Session	Fall Semester Spring Semester Summer Session	Each of the four quarters	Fall Semester Spring Semester	Fall Semester Spring Semester
Activities	Maintain Daily Log	.Develop Plan .Maintain Log of duties and assignments .Attend two day workshop in Spring	Develop Plan Attend Seminars Major Project	Submit four reports on Competencies selected and progress made	Perform activities specified by the Department	.Develop Training Plan .Maintain Daily Log .Monthly Reports

TABLE 4 SPECIFIC COMPONENTS: STUDENT (CONTINUED)

COMPONENT \ INSTITUTION	CSSJ	STANFORD	UCB	UCLA	USC	U OF ID/IHO
Selection	.Be accepted into Graduate Status .Complete course "Intro to School Admin" .Recommendations from field admin. .Oral interview with Dept/Field Committee	.Be accepted into Graduate Status, Dept. program and Cert. program .Advisor's reference .Recommendation from a field administrator .Statement of career objectives	Graduate standing and acceptance in ASC program	Be admitted to M.Ed. or Ed.D. program . GRE (1000) . 3.0 GPA	.Be admitted into an ACS Program by Dept. Screening Committee .Use of academic and experience records and personal interview	.Graduate Status .Be admitted into Admin. Cert. Program . 2.70 GPA . Verification of leadership potential
Application	Apply to Dept. semester before internship Written approval Dist. Supt.	Apply to program advisor and plan total program upon admission to graduate status	Complete three of seven core courses in Ed.Ad. Develop Plan Apply to ASC Program Coordinator	Apply to Dept. Head	Submit form to supervising administrator and then university supervisor	Apply to University Internship Coordinator
Admission	By Dept. Screening Committee and approval of Department Head	By program advisor	By ACS Program Coordinator based on Plan	Must be a full time student University advisor and Department Head	When screening process is completed by Dept. for admission to ASC program University Supervisor approval	When a proposal has been worked out with supervising administrator and approved by Internship Coordinator
Registration	Occurs at first "all day" seminar session in Fall. Re-register in Spring	Fall quarter only	Fall Quarter Winter Quarter Spring Quarter	Begin in Fall Quarter Re-register Winter and Spring Quarters	Enroll in course	Enroll in course Fall semester
Activities	Develop Plan based on general listing of competencies and job description of District Seminar planning	.Seven general objectives stated by Dept (20 hrs. per week) .Maintain Journal .Complete essay on major component	Maintain a Log	Based on a Contract among Intern, Supervising Administrator and University Supervisor	Attend Orientation meeting Develop tentative Plan based on required competencies Develop final Plan in one month	Select activities from (38) Departmental "Tasks/ Competencies listing

TABLE 4 SPECIFIC COMPONENTS: STUDENT (CONTINUED)

INSTITUTION / COMPONENT	U OF ILL	UM	PSU	UO	UW	WSU	UW(M)
Selection	Be admitted into Admin. Cert. Program	Be admitted into a graduate degree program by the Dept. of Ed.Ad. Final selection by University Coordinator when District approves	Be admitted to M.Ed. and Admin. Cred. Programs	Be admitted to Admin. Cert. Program* .Possess masters .Three letters of reference .Satisfactory scale (40%) on MAT	Be admitted to a degree and Admin. Cert. Program	Admission into either degree or Admin. Cert. Program (by Consortium Screening Committee .Recommendations from field admin and professional ass'n representative	Admission into the Educational Specialist or Doctoral Programs
Application	Through University advisor	Fill in Department application with advisor's Approval	Through University advisor	Through University advisor	Through the Dept. of Ed.Ad. Complete form Approved by University advisor	By August 1 for Fall Registration by completing Field Project Forms	Apply to University Coordinator six months in advance
Admission	When a site has been selected and a Clinical Experience Contract is approved by the University Supervisor	When admitted to Graduate School and nearing completion of Admin. Cert. Program Apply to Internship Coordinator	When prerequisite courses have been completed By department	*By five member committee appointed by Dept when supervising administrator and University Advisor approve Plan	When prerequisite courses are completed and acceptance of a Plan by University supervisor	Through Internship Coordinator	By University Coordinator and University Advisor .Completion of basic Ed.Ad. courses .Demonstrated interest in educational leadership
Registration	Enroll in appropriate course Fall Semester Spring Semester	Enroll at any quarter for three quarters of internship	Fall Quarter Winter Quarter Spring Quarter	Fall Semester Spring Semester	Enroll for two quarter hours each of three quarters with University Advisor approval	Register for six semester hours credit in absentia by August 1	-
Activities	Complete activities in "Clinical Experience Contract" (Plan) Maintain a portfolio of activities	Complete a year long Plan of activities based on specified .Maintain daily Log	Develop Plan include activities and a Major Project .Maintain Log of major activities	Develop written statement of the assignment (Plan)	Develop Plan Submit monthly report on activities to supervising administrator and university supervisor Attend seminars	.Develop Plan based on Consortium specified competencies .Maintain Log .Attend seminars	.Complete specified competency activities .Attend seminars .Major Project

was only possible to determine which institutions included this component and which did not.

- Major Project Included Institutions: NAU (special or unique problems with an analysis of them should be made); The U of A (a major project which is an outgrowth of an administrative responsibility); CSLA (three written reports in a specified format); CS Northridge (undertake a significant project); Stanford U (complete a bibliographic essay on the major component of the internship); UCLA (two or three long term projects); PSU; and UW(M) (a major project to include "in depth" experience over a period of several months).
- Not Included: ASU; CSSF; CSSJ; UCB; USC; U of Idaho; U of Illinois; UM (may include a special project); OU; UW; and WSU.

Specifics

This section summarizes the essential specific aspects of the internship according to the functions performed by the parties and/or agencies who participate in this program. Namely, the intern, the cooperating agency (usually a school district and/or individual school), and the institution of higher education which offers the internship as part of its overall administrative preparation program. The aspects of the internship that may be ascribed to each of these three parties is analyzed in turn for each of the institutions studied.

Student

Selection

As shown in Table 4, the most common occurrence in the selection of candidates for the internship is admittance to either a degree program or an administrative certification program. Six institutions, ASU, NAU, CSLA, CS Northridge, UCB and WSU, share this requirement. Four institutions, Stanford U, PSU, UW and the U of Idaho, require students to be accepted in both degree and

certification programs. Four institutions, the U of A, USC, U of Illinois and UO, require only admission to certification programs, while three institutions, UCLA, UM and UW(M), require admission only into a degree program. Two institutions, CSSF and CSSJ, specify only the requirement of Graduate Status.

Application

The most common procedure for internship application is to proceed through the department or the administrative internship coordinator. Also most institutions require application to be made either the semester or quarter before the internship is to take place. In a number of cases, application is made through the student's university program advisor as a part of the overall program planning.

Admission

Admission to internship programs is permitted in eight of the institutions upon the approval of the university coordinator. Usually this admission is granted after admission to a program has been completed and the intern has worked out a plan which is satisfactory to a supervising administrator. All of the California state institutions and USC and UO have some formal screening mechanism for admitting candidates to the internship program. This in all likelihood is a function of the Commission (CTPL) guidelines in California and the TSPC which requires this procedure. The U of Illinois, Stanford U and UCLA permit admission upon approval of the student's university advisor and PSU requires formal admission by the department.

Registration

The registration procedures for the internship appear to vary only as university calendar and registration schedules stipulate. In cases where more than one semester or quarter of internship is required, only UM and the U of Idaho seem to have made a breakthrough in having one registration suffice for the entire length of the internship. Also from the data gathered, it appears

that the three Arizona institutions are unique in offering summer internship programs.*

Activities

As indicated earlier (see Structure), the most common aspect of the internship activities is the development by the intern of a plan in conjunction with the supervising administrator and/or the university supervisor. Twelve institutions have this requirement in one form or another. Seminar attendance and the completion of major projects are other commonly found activities. Also somewhat ubiquitous is the inclusion of the keeping of a log or diary. Eight institutions require biweekly or monthly reports of activities.

Cooperating Agency

Selection

In all but four institutions, Stanford U, UCLA, UM and UW(M), the selection of the cooperating agency is usually a function of the place of the intern's employment. Also, most institutions place the burden of obtaining a site for field experience on the intern. The four institutions which place interns in sites represent those whose expectations are for either a half time or full time commitment by the intern to the program.

Compensation

In virtually all institutions the hope is for the intern to receive either compensation or released time in order to be able to devote enough time to administrative activities in order to make the internship experience comprehensive and intense. However, the financial wherewithal to accomplish this hope has not been abundantly in evidence. In general the institutions that emphasize a full time internship appear to have had some success in placing interns in

*WU states: "Occasionally internships are carried out in the summer."

situations where some remuneration is provided. For example, Stanford U states that interns are usually paid either $500-$600 a month for working half time for a semester or $1800 for working half time for a quarter. UM states that interns "should" receive 9/10 of the appropriate placement on the teachers' salary schedule. The UO indicated that students who complete their practicum (internship) requirements with the Field Training and Service Bureau are paid at the rate of Graduate Assistants. The UW(M) states that intern compensation should equivalent to a staff member with similar qualifications.

In two cases where the internship is not expected to be a full time commitment, "released time" provisions are stated as follows: WU--". . . should provide 180 clock hours with no reduction in pay." WSU--". . . should provide released time of six hours per week."

Functions of Supervising Administrators

A great deal of commonality was found in university expectations for supervising administrators. In general these functions are:

- Help develop the internship plan of activities, (competencies), major project, etc.
- Supervise the intern on a day to day basis.
- Perform some type of evaluation function concerning the intern's performance.

On the latter function, most institutions have some formal mechanism for receiving the evaluation inputs from the supervising administrator. However, the U of A, CS Northridge, Stanford U, PSU, and WU essentially rely on informal evaluation procedures based on three party conferences among intern, supervising administrator and university supervisor at periodic site visits by the university supervisor.

It is interesting to note that only two institutions, CSLA and UCB, specify that they hold inservice or orientation programs for supervising administrators. Also, three institutions, CSSJ, UCB, and UW(M), state that supervising administrators should participate in intern's seminars.* Only one institution, USC, specified any criteria for the selection of the supervising administrator--". . . should be one who has had at least one year of administrative experience and is not serving in a new position."

Contract/Legal Agreements

Insofar as various application and other forms provided by the institutions address this topic, it can be concluded that most commonly the application of the intern to the institution which contains the signature of an administrator in the field agreeing to be the supervisor constitutes the formal contract between the cooperating agency and the institution of higher education. In some cases the signature of the superintendent of schools or his/her designee is also required. NAU stipulates that the university supervisor must make a site visit to obtain the District's written authorization. OU requires a letter of agreement from the District's Chief Executive and WSU requires the ". . . written agreement of the Board."

Institutional

Academic Provisions

Credit. One fairly typical way of granting credit for the internship is that based on clock hour equivalency. Seven institutions, ASU, The U of A, CS Northridge, USC, PSU, WU and WSU, stipulate this type of measurement and the credit/clock hour ratio is typically one semester hour of credit for from thirty

---

*The practice at The U of A is to invite supervising administrators to seminars; however, such attendance is light.

(30) to fifty (50) clock hours. The amount of credit hours required for the internship varies on a semester hours basis from three (3) to nine (9) semester hours and from two (2) to nine (9) quarter hours. Nine (9) of the institutions required a year long internship on either a full time , UM and UW(M), or part time, CSLA, CS Northridge, CSSJ, UCB, U of Idaho, WU and WSU, basis. Nau stipulates that unless the intern is able to devote a minimum of one half time to the internship, the internship shall be two semesters in length. Two institutions, Stanford U and UM, specify that credit for the internship is based on seminar attendance and not the internship activities; UCB stipulates that one-fifth of the credit earned for the internship is based on "classroom activities."

Prerequisites

Almost every institution requires some coursework in educational administration before the student may participate in the internship. At ASU, CS Northridge, U of Idaho, UM, WU and WSU, the internship is the culminating course in degree or certification programs. An equally common mode is the prerequisite requirement of a core of anywhere from twelve (12) to sixteen (16) semester hours. NAU, The U of A, Stanford U, USC, U of Illinois and PSU stipulate this requirement. The provision of taking some form of survey or introductory course is practiced by three institutions: ASU, CSSJ and UCLA.

Grading/Evaluation

A "pass/fail" type of grade is awarded in virtually all the institutions; only UCB, PSU and the UW(M) use letter grades. Undoubtedly the reason for the widespread use of "pass/fail" grading is directly related to the difficulty encountered in evaluating the quality of the internship because of the multitude of variables encountered in the tripartite relationship found in the internship. In all cases, however, the final grade is awarded by the university supervisor after some form of input from the supervising administrator.

The evaluation component of the student's responsibilities was the most elusive one when attempting to determine any clearly discernable procedures. For the most part intern written reports, supervising administrator's written and oral reports and university advisors judgements based on personal observations are used in some fashion to arrive at a determination of the satisfactoriness of the internship. A number of institutions provide checklist evaluation instruments which cover competency categories; however, in many cases the competencies listed on these instruments fail to correspond with initial competencies specified for the internship. Also there is overall a lack of criteria for making judgements on these instruments.

Perhaps the most telling analysis of the state of the art of evaluation in educational administration and the internship specifically is contained in this statement from the Administrators Educational Consortium (Educational Service District No. 123, Washington)

> Development of evaluative criteria and standards or norms of performance is still in the development stage. It is hoped that, as the theory of administration becomes more developed or concrete, norms of performance will be identified and will gain support of practicing administrators and training institutions. For the present the consortium will rely on the sound judgement of the Evaluation Committee in evaluating and adjudicating possession of the designated competencies until more scientific methods are available (55, p. 41).

Departmental Structure

Internship Coordination

It is at the institutional level that the overall responsibility for coordinating the internship components occurred. There is a great deal of commonality in the type of functions that are performed by one or more faculty in the departmental level in planning, coordinating and, finally, in implementing internship programs. In general these functions include:

. Orienting the intern to the program structure and activities

. Assisting in the development of the overall plan of individual internships and approving the completed plan

. Assisting in finding sites for the internship

. Making site visits to work with the intern and supervising administrator

. Planning and implementing seminars

. Evaluating the internship and awarding the final grade.

Of the above functions the making of site visits is the most often stipulated responsibility of university supervisors. It may be of some interest to present the institutional expectations regarding the number of such visits in cases where these data were specified:

> ASU (three per semester); The U of A (one per semester); CSLA (two per quarter); CSSJ (four per year); Stanford U (two per quarter); UCB (four per year); U of Idaho (1-2 per semester); WU (two per semester); WSU (three per year).

Implementation

Another interesting aspect of this component is how and who coordinates and implements the internship. In general three ways of handling coordination and supervision were found:

Department designated coordinator both coordinates and implements the entire program. This is essentially the way the internship occurs at: ASU, the U of A, UCB, Stanford U (Public School and Higher Education are assigned to two people as separate responsibilities within one department), and UM (one coordinator for elementary and one coordinator for secondary).

Department designated coordinator assumes overall responsibility for the program, but all faculty take part in implementation. This is essentially the way the internship occurrs at: NAU, CSLA, U of Idaho, WSU (a college level administrator,

Coordinator of Student Teaching and Personnel, is responsible for most of the procedural aspects. All faculty members participate in advising students and in coordinating and implementing individual internships), and UW(M). At UW(M) Public School (K-12), Higher Education, Vocational Technical Adult Education and Special Education are assigned to four individuals as separate responsibilities within one department.

Department Head serves as internship coordinator and all faculty take part in implementation. This is the most common structure for the internship at eight of the institutions studied: CS Northridge, CSSF (faculty members supervised their program advisees), CSSJ (faculty members assigned advisees for internship according to alphabetical groupings), UCLA (two faculty members assigned to supervise interns), USC (one faculty member per semester assigned internship supervision on a rotating basis), PSU, UO (faculty members supervise program advisees), and WU (faculty members supervise program advisees).

Faculty Load/Equivalency

As might be expected there is a great deal of variance in practice in the assessment of faculty load equivalency for various responsibilities connected with the internship program. In only two institutions was the coordination and implementation of the internship found to be a full time responsibility. Both ASU and UCB followed this practice. In all of the other institutions, coordinating and/or supervising interns is a part of a total faculty load which consists of the usual responsibilities of teaching, independent studies, research and various committee assignments. The equivalencies as reported by these institutions are shown below:

NAU--two interns, extensive travel = one course hour

--three interns, light travel = one course hour

The U of A--coordinate/supervise = one-fourth of twelve hour load

CSLA--four interns per quarter = one-twelfth faculty load

CS Northridge--thirty interns per semester = two-fifths faculty load

CSSF--eight interns per semester = one course

CSSJ--.48 of a twelve unit load (usually four to eight interns per faculty member)

Stanford U--fourteen to sixteen interns = one course

UCLA--five interns = one course

USC--seven to fourteen interns = one course

U of Idaho--part of overall responsibility (two to four interns per year)

PSU--nine interns = one course

UO--nine interns = one course

WU--eight to fourteen interns = one course

WSU--six to eight interns = one course